



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to the third person, and at present, both for German and Romance territory, the use of the third person is extended so as to cover the first and second also. The author is disposed to agree with Brugmann in his opinion that the German *sich* in these circumstances represents almost exclusively the reflexive *uns*, and is equivalent, therefore, to M. H. G. *unsich*, but considers it impossible that the *s* so commonly found in the folk-speech (*soldat bin ichs gewesen*) should represent the first and second persons. In the Italian, however, he would place the *si*=*ci*, which we find in such expressions as *noi si alziamo*, *noi si fermiamo*, etc. In the Ladinian the reflexive third person has usurped the office of the other persons. This is specially noted, and the writer concludes, therefore, with Miklosich, that for both German and Romance there are cases where the reflexive third person stands for the first and second, and which cannot be accounted for by Slavonic influence.

In no department of grammar-forms, however, is the interchange of elements more frequent and extended than in the particles. Here, it is translation, substitution with meaning slightly different from the original, or the full transference of the thought into another sphere of ideas, that marks the passage of expression from the Slavonic to German and Neo-Latin mould, or vice versa.

The author ends his epoch-making essay with observations upon some pedagogical questions that have claimed the attention of educators, not only in Germany, but also in this country. He would urge the practical learning of a language, if possible, in infancy, and does not hold to the doctrine that the mother tongue is injured thereby, citing, in practical support of his view, the fluency with which the Cymric is used, though not cultivated in the public schools.

The whole treatise, as it lies before us, is one of the most important contributions to the science of dialectology that have appeared up to this time. The broad problems of language-making that are here discussed make it of prime interest to the student of comparative philology, as well as to the specialist in Teutonic and Romance languages.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

College Series of Greek Authors, edited under the supervision of John Williams White, Lewis R. Packard, and Thomas D. Seymour. Sophocles *Antigone*. Edited on the basis of Wolff's edition, by MARTIN L. D'OOGHE, Professor of Greek in the University of Michigan. Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1884. Pp. iv, 192, paper.

Among the more notable of recent enterprises in classical philology in the United States are the College Series of Greek Authors, of which Professor D'Ooghe's *Antigone* is the first volume to appear, published in Boston, and Harper's Classical Series, under the editorial supervision of Prof. Drisler, published in New York. In the former series, approved German editions are announced as forming the basis of the American editions; for the latter series there is no such restriction. The object of the College Series (for which more than twenty American scholars are writing), as given in the editors' prospectus, is to furnish in rapid succession, at the rate of from three to six volumes each

year, editions of Greek authors, with notes which embody the best results of recent philological research. The plan of the editors, in part published in this prospectus, is elaborated with considerable detail. It is a peculiar feature of these volumes that the notes are printed on the same page with the text, while separate text-editions, without notes, for class-room use are also provided.

Professor D'Ooge's *Antigone* is based on Gustav Wolff's second edition, Leipzig, 1873 (of the Teubner series), and free use has been made of the work of Wolff's German reviser, Bellermann, and of other recent editors. The lyrical parts have been arranged after J. H. H. Schmidt, though his text has not been followed. There is a brief preface, followed by two introductions (Wolff's "Vorausliegende Sage," and "Rückblick," much abridged), and by the Greek text of the two *ὑποθέσεις* with English notes. The play itself is divided into nine scenes; and the usual Greek designations of the parts of the drama (*πρόλογος*, *παρόδος* κτέ.) are retained and are printed within the text.

In his text the editor has followed Wolff closely, except in about ninety passages. As Wolff's critical principles have thus governed Professor D'Ooge, it will be well to cite them: "Bei Constituirung des Textes habe ich mich möglichst dem Laur. A. angeschlossen . . . Wo diese Handschrift Falsches bietet, schliesse ich mich an den Par. A. an. Er gehört meiner Ansicht nach einer anderen Familie an als Laur. A. Wenn beide Hss. nicht ausreichen und die Scholien oder alte Anführungen nicht ausreichen, nehme ich Vermutungen auf, oder, was dem gleich ist, Lesarten geringerer Hss." In his deviations from W., Professor D'Ooge has in most cases been more conservative in preferring the frequently difficult readings—or what W. called "Falsches"—of L. to the readings of inferior MSS, or to conjectures. The reasons for these changes are generally given in the critical appendix. The rejected readings of W. are placed at the foot of the text. As it is these changes that give D'O.'s text its individuality, some of them should be cited, not including the forty-five places where D'O.'s revision and Bellermann's are coincident, viz.: on vv. 108, 138, 151, 241, 269, 280, 326, 342, 359, 366, 439, 454 to 605, 670 to 834 except 718, 905 to 965, 970, 1080 to 1115, 1129, 1265, 1341. At 24, D'Ooge has *χρησθείς*—Wolff, *χρηστοίς*. 71, *ὁποία*—*ὁποία*. 211, *Κρέων*—*κυρεῖν*. 213, *γ' ἐνεστί σοι*—*μέτεστί σοι*. 223, *οὐχ ὅπως τάχους*—*οὐχ, ὅπως σπονδῆς*. 231, *σπονδῇ*—*σχολῇ*. 318, *τί δαί;* *ῥυθμίζεις*—*τί δαί ῥυθμίζεις*. 351 l., *ὑπάξεται*—*ἔσας ἀγει*. 368 l., *παείρων*—*πληρῶν*. 452, *τοιούσδ'*—*οἱ τοῦσδ'*. 612 l. ff., *ἐπαρκέσει νόμος ὃδ'· οὐδὲν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίβτῳ πλημμελές*—*ἐπαρκέσαι νόμον. ὃ δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει θνατῶν βίωτος πάμπολις*. 659, *γ' ἐγγενή*—*συγγενή*. 718, *θυμοῦ*—*μῦθος*. 1303, *λάχος*—*λέχος*.

From an examination of his readings it will be seen that Professor D'Ooge has exercised independent judgment in constituting his text. Though original grounds in defence of the text are sometimes given, we have failed to discover more than one conjectural emendation original with Professor D'Ooge. V. 572 is, with the MSS, given to Ismene. In defence of this, σφ', referring to *Antigone*, is suggested for the MSS σ', but this reading is not admitted into the text. The editor's aim has been to adapt the commentary "to the needs of students beginning their study of Greek tragedy with this play." The notes are brief and to the point: there are many grammatical references to the grammars of Goodwin and of Hadley-Allen: once or twice Krüger's Sprach-

lehre and Kühner's Ausführl. Gram. are referred to. Translations into English are frequently given as the best form of commentary. These translations are generally quite literal, and are not put into rhythmical prose, which when written with poetical feeling often reveals something of the spirit, as well as gives the crude meaning, of the original. There are abundant illustrations both of the language and of the sentiment, from Greek, Roman, and English writers. In the illustrations from English poets, mostly dramatic, this edition is richer than any other known to us. The names of Herrick, Granville (on 1158, where Tennyson's "Turn, fortune, turn thy wheel," is apposite), Lee, Ford, Webster, Shirley, Coleridge, Congreve, Davenant, Rogers, Mason, Gray (on 528, Agrippina, II 193, where "clear" should be read for "fair"), Thomson, Chaucer, Milton (five times), and Shakespeare (seventeen times) are met with. In Tit. Andr. i 2, 301 on 390, "tricks," which is not Shakespearean in the sense "deceive," is wrongly given for "mocks." "Coach-fellow in affliction" (on 541, as illustrating ξύμπλουν) is given as Shakespeare's. Where is this found? "Coachfellow" occurs in Merry Wives of W., ii, 2, 7, but there seems to mean 'mate in drawing the coach' (A. Schmidt), and thus is not quite in point with ξύμπλουν. Was Professor D'Ooge thinking of "Heart's discontent and sour affliction Be playfellows to keep you company" (K. Henry VI, Part II, iii, 2, 301)? The poet is interpreted largely by himself by parallel citations from other plays and from other dramatists, and there are many apt extracts from the Scholia. In all these citations the gist of the matter is uniformly given, and not a mere reference. While the editor has constantly aimed to make the poet's meaning clear, the peculiarities of poetic speech and several other features of the poet's literary art do not receive the attention that would have been demanded in a book designed for advanced students. And yet even beginners in Greek tragedy should be reminded of the normal Attic prose equivalents, not only in the forms used, but also in syntax and diction, in order duly to appreciate a work of poetic art. Not all such matters can safely be relegated to the oral commentary.

In the exegetical notes the following matters call for comment and criticism; in making our comments we keep in mind the editor's avowed object—to adapt the book to beginners.

10. Read *evils are proceeding* (cf. 288, Frag. 90, 2). Between 276 and 565 insert 'esp. 438.' The reasons for Soph.'s use of plu. 'for sing.' are nowhere adequately given. The explanation suggested in note on 10 does not cover all cases. 25. In the note on νεκροῖς the matter is stated too positively. Cf. Tarbell, Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. 1884, p. 36 ff. 36. To support the difficult word δημόλειστον, Eur. Or. 442, Aesch. Sept. 199, might well have been cited. 39. Note on δ' wanted; also on ἐγώ. 41. 'the more usual -η' requires defence. 43. 'Antigone holds up her right hand,' is not a certain interpretation in explanation of εἰν τῇδε χερσί. 45. γοῦν is to be taken with τὸν ἐμὸν and not with θάψω understood. 50. νῶν not ethical dat., cf. Hdt. VI 9, οὐδέ σφι . . . τὰ ἴδια ἐμπεπρήσεται. 74-5. Cic. ad Att. XII 18, 'Longum illud tempus cum non ero magis me movet quam hoc exiguum,' might well have been cited. 99. 'Antigone retires behind the left periaktes'? 107. φῶτα; note wanted. Cf. ὁ Λάκων, Plat. Phaedr. 260e. 221. Note on the article in ὁ μισθός. 260. 'The impf. for the sake of vividness, placing the strife in the present.' But the

impf. with *ἄν* may have reference to the past. Conversely we have the aor. with *ἄν* referring to present, O. T. 403, Eur. Alc. 738. 274. *ἐνίκα*, *came to prevail*. 308. Campbell's 'confusion' is objectionable. There is a partial fusion or an imperfect blending, but no confusion. 322. *γε* is not *yes*; join with *ἀργύρῳ*. 354. *φθέγμα*, *speech*; better, *utterance*. Soph. probably had no theory in mind as to the origin of language, as seems to be inferred from D'O.'s extract from Schneidewin. 389. Cf. "sober second thoughts." Eur. Hipp. 435, *κὰν βροτοῖς | αἱ δέυτεραί πως φροντίδες σοφώτεραι*. Dryden, Spanish Friar, ii 2, "Second thoughts, they say, are best." 442. *μὴ* must be joined with *δεδρακέναι*. Cf. 443. 454 ff. Professor Goodwin's explanation (1876), here cited, was anticipated by Kruse in 1875 (Prog. Gymn. Greifswald), if not by others. 458. With Antigone's resolution, to be true to her conscience in the face of peril, might well have been compared the language of Neoptolemus in Phil. 902-3. 517. Note on *ὤλετο* wanted. 605. 'The potential optative with *ἄν* omitted' is an unscientific way of putting it. 661. Parallel passages should have been given in illustration. 718. '*μετάσταςιν* alone is too vague,' therefore *θυμοῦ* is limiting genitive,—a poor reason for a good interpretation. Apart from the uncertainty of the reading *θυμοῦ*—most MSS give *θυμῷ*, Porson *θυμόν*, W. *μίθῳ*, etc., which must be joined in some way with *εἶκε*—the word may limit *εἶκε* and at the same time float before the mind with *μετάσταςιν*, *but from thy wrath draw back, and grant a change therein*. 907. The reasoning in this note is based on what seems to be a wrong conception of *βία πολιτῶν*. As in 79, *βία πολιτῶν* evidently here means *in defiance of the will of the citizens*, i. e. 'the state.' The poet unconsciously uses a phrase that an Athenian of his own time would use (cf. *ἀρχαιογόνων*, 980, where D'O.'s explanation is not complete, *πάλλαι*, O. T. 1). Cf. *ἐγὼ σφε θάψω κὰν ἀπενέπη πόλιν*, Eur. Phoen. 1657. 908. For *surely* read *pray*. 1035. *τῶν ὑπαὶ γένους*. Sophocles again puts words into the mouth of an actor to represent the sentiments of many in his own time. Cf. Eur. El. 399 f., Iph. Aul. 956-8, Plat. Laws, X 908d, etc. On the whole subject, see L. Schmidt, *Ethik der Griechen*, II, p. 59 ff. 1115 fifth line; cases should have been given. 1172. *βασιλέων* probably refers to the absent Creon and Eurydice; *τεθνᾶσιν* in the mouth of the messenger is simply 'death.' 1233. 'But the next moment he is stung with a feeling of self-reproach (*αὐτῷ χολωθείς*).' His anger was perhaps due to his failure to kill his father. It would be more modern, more 'realistic' (see on 523), to give Haemon twinges of remorse, but the Greek poet gives us plastic figures of fixed purpose and passion. 1241. *τέλη*; if the 'marriage rite was sometimes called *τέλος*,' *τέλη* can hardly be 'the consummation of the nuptials.'

In the critical appendix, after a list of the principal MSS and editions referred to, is given what Nauck calls *potior lectionis varietas*, or brief accounts of the most important variants in the chief MSS, and of conjectural emendations. In these critical notes many of the readings are discussed in an instructive manner, the editor's aim being to furnish "sufficient material for an intelligent appreciation of the most important problems in the textual criticism of the play." Here the editor cannot be writing for beginners in Greek tragedy. A critical commentary for them would be like quaternions for babes. In a critical commentary, it should be the editor's aim to give to the proficient student the best results, thoroughly sifted, of recent philological studies in the

text of his author. If the limits of space forbid a full discussion of many points, there should be given throughout due indications to the literature of the subject.

Professor D'Ooge has recognized these facts, but not at all times with enough clearness. Thus the literature on the MSS is not given; the relation of Laur. A to Par. A is dismissed with the remark that "L is believed by many to be the archetype of all the other codices of Sophocles extant," and that "A is regarded by some as the chief of a different family of MSS from that of which L is the archetype." In these matters authorities are weighed, not counted. Professor D'Ooge is not always consistent in indicating where the emendations cited were originally given. In furnishing the data for the probable reading in difficult places, the *concinmitas Sophoclea*, an exceedingly instructive consideration for beginners in text criticism, is not sufficiently appealed to.

On v. 4 attention should have been called to the dittography by which the ἀτης ἀτερ of the MSS is explained by Dindorf as arising from the ἀτήσιμον of the text. 24. Under Margoliouth, whom, in view of his peculiar attitude toward the text, it seems strange to cite without a word of caution, after χθονός insert 'proposed by H. Schütz.' 124. Schenkel, in 1874, had proposed ἀμὲρ φῶτ' ἐτάθη here given to Schmidt. 351. G[erhard] H[einrich] Miller should read "Müller." He now calls himself Heinrich Müller. 514. Escher's ἐκείνον, suggested on syntactical grounds from the *concinmitas Sophoclea*, would have been interesting, as also on 575, Wieseler's ἐπι (=ἐπεστι), where L, gives ἐμοί. 675. C. F. Müller's ῥοπάς is more plausible than Keck's τάξεις cited, and on 680 his κούκ εὐ γυναικῶν is suggestive. Cf., for similar separation of εὐ from its word, 904. 747. οὐ τᾶν (=οὔτοι ἂν) here belongs to Elmsley, and not to Porson. Porson had suggested on Eur. Med. 867 (Dind.), οὐ τᾶν (which he wrote οὐτ' ἂν, i. e. οὔτοι ἂν, with *crasis*) for the MSS οὐκ ἂν. Elmsley, in his note on Eur. Med. 867, adopts the suggestion, and makes a similar conjecture for Soph. Ant. 747; he would also read οὐτ' ἂν (i. e. οὐ τᾶν) in Aj. 1339 for οὐκ ἂν of LL², οὐκ οὖν of A. Vat. 1098. Rauchenstein's τὰ νῦν for the impossible λακεῖν L is instructive.

There is no index. This is unfortunate, since an index, while perhaps not quite the "soul of a book," as Scaliger called it, if properly constructed adds value to a book by making its contents immediately available. A full classified index to the text and notes, like that of Professor Gildersleeve's Pindar, or of Mr. Verrall's smaller Euripides' Medea, might have been made not only a sort of epitome of Sophoclean grammar and of dramatic usage, and a guide to the illustrative literature, but also a clue to the principal contents of the poem.

The printer has done his work with excellent taste. No pages of a Greek book could be more attractive to the eye than are many pages of this book. The proof-reading has been accurate in the main, and none of the slips are misleading. The following corrections should be made: 24N. δίκη. 175N. ἀμήχανον. 234N., 393N. Thuc. 263N. οὐδ' ἂν . . . ἀλλ'. 342 W. κούφονέων. 500N. μηδ'. 568. παντοῦ. 722N. εἰ δ' οὖν. 731N. Kvičala. 898N. εἰσίδω. 910N. τοῦδ'. 944N. Pausan. 968 W. Θρηκῶν. 1036. πάλαι. 1068N. ἀνθ' ὧν. 1083. ἀνόσιον. 1108. ἂν. 1225N. Propert. 1302N. Anth. Pal. P. 170. Meineke's Beiträge zur philologischen Kritik. Bonitz's B. zur. Kvičala's B. zur. In the critical notes: on 4. οὐτ'. 447 L ἥιδευσ τὰ (not ἥιδει στα)[?]. 467. δυντ'. 1111. τῆδ'. 1310. αἰαί. 1345 (not 1346).

The matters that we have selected for unfavorable comment are of minor importance. The book remains one of the most satisfactory editions yet produced of a Greek play for schools and colleges, with English notes. It is uniformly marked by a sense of proportion and of perspective, qualities too often lacking in books of this class, as in oral instruction. The appearance of such books promises well for the future of classical scholarship as cultivated at American institutions of learning.

J. H. WRIGHT.

The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels, by EDWIN A. ABBOTT, D. D., and W. G. RUSHBROOKE, M. L. London, Macmillan & Co., 1884.

We have been meaning for some time to review this little book, not so much on account of the completeness of the theory which it unfolds, for it is by its own admission only fragmentary and preliminary to a much larger work, as because it affords an opportunity of discussing one or two critical questions connected with the new and careful investigation which is being made to revive the theory of an ancestral gospel (= Proto-Mark), from which the three synoptics made up their record.

Obviously there can be few questions of greater theological importance than those connected with the mutual relations of the Gospels, and certainly none of greater critical difficulty and uncertainty; but the American Journal of Philology is not the place to discuss great and vital problems in theology. Hence we shall confine ourselves to a brief sketch of the book and a few remarks. It contains an attempt to popularize the method of extraction of the common early Synoptic Tradition which Dr. Abbott explained in his article in the Encyclopedia Britannica, and which led to the beautiful volumes (known as *Synopticon*, which should be interpreted to mean Printer's Martyrdom), in which Mr. Rushbrooke exhibited to the eye, by varieties of colored ink and spacing of type, the common or solitary portions of the Gospels arranged in a quasi-harmonistic form.

We are first told that the Proto-Mark theory, if established, will be of great importance because, when we show that three separate writers have worked the primitive documents up in somewhat different manner, without mutual communication, we have a triple testimony of the truth of the matter contained, on the principle of Philo's dictum that "a sacred matter is tested by three witnesses" coupled with the Johannine statement that "there are three that bear record." We venture to say that no one will see in this argument anything more than an obscure reference to the doctrine of the Trinity; for according to the assumption, the three witnesses are one. The Proto-Mark theory may be correct enough, but this is hardly the way to commend the evidence of it to people who believed they had three witnesses on the point before Proto-Mark was started.

Attention is then drawn to the fact that in many parts of the Synoptics Mark contains all that is common to Matthew and Luke, from which fact the modern theory takes its departure. It is also shown that in many passages there is reason to believe that Matthew and Luke modified, or made more intelligible, or improved the language of Mark. All this is perfectly plausible and reasonable, and would agree almost as well with the theory of an Aramaic Proto-Mark as with a Greek original.